

**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR  
SACRAMENTO SESSION  
NOVEMBER 5 and 6, 2008**

The following cases are placed upon the calendar of the Supreme Court for oral argument at its courtroom in the Stanley Mosk Library and Courts Building, 914 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California, on November 5 and 6, 2008.

**WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2008 — 1:30 P.M.**

- |     |         |                                                                                                                                                                           |
|-----|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (1) | S156898 | In re Corrine W.                                                                                                                                                          |
| (2) | S142209 | Prospect Medical Group, Inc., et al. v. Northridge<br>Emergency Medical Group ( <i>Werdegard, J., not participating;<br/>McDonald, J., assigned justice pro tempore</i> ) |
| (3) | S156797 | Patel v. Liebermensch et al.                                                                                                                                              |

**THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2008 — 9:00 A.M.**

- |     |         |                                                   |
|-----|---------|---------------------------------------------------|
| (4) | S150371 | Schatz v. Allen Matkins Leck Gamble & Mallory LLP |
| (5) | S156045 | Musaelian v. Adams et al. (Warner, Objector)      |
| (6) | S158043 | In re Jose C.                                     |

\_\_\_\_\_  
GEORGE  
*Chief Justice*

If exhibits are to be transmitted to this court, counsel must apply to the court for permission. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.224(c).)

**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR  
SACRAMENTO SESSION  
NOVEMBER 5 and 6, 2008**

The following case summaries are issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has scheduled for oral argument and of their general subject matter. Generally, the descriptions set out below are reproduced from the original news release issued when review in each of these matters was granted and are provided for the convenience of the public and the press. The descriptions do not necessarily reflect the view of the court or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.

**WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2008—1:30 P.M.**

**(1) *In re Corrine W., S156898***

#07-437 *In re Corrine W., S156898.* (A115584; 154 Cal.App.4th 427; Superior Court of Contra Costa County; J06-00168.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order in a juvenile dependency proceeding. This case presents the following issue: Does Welfare and Institutions Code section 11460, subdivision (b), which requires that foster parents be paid for “food, clothing, shelter, daily supervision, school supplies, a child’s personal incidentals, [and] liability insurance with respect to a child,” require reimbursement of the costs of automobile liability insurance so that a teenaged foster child can drive?

**(2) *Prospect Medical Group, Inc., et al. v. Northridge Emergency Medical Group, S142209 (Werdegar, J., not participating; McDonald, J., assigned justice pro tempore)***

#06-61 *Prospect Medical Group, Inc., et al. v. Northridge Emergency Medical Group, S142209.* (B172737, B172817; 136 Cal.App.4th 1155; Superior Court of Los Angeles County; BC300850, SC076909.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Does Health and Safety Code section 1379 prohibit emergency room physicians who are not in contract with a health care service plan from “balance billing”

plan member patients for the balance of the physician's fees not paid by the health care service plan or its delegate?

**(3) *Patel v. Liebermensch et al., S156797***

#07-439 Patel v. Liebermensch et al., S156797. (D048582; 154 Cal.App.4th 373; Superior Court of San Diego County; GIC839199.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Are the time and manner of payment essential terms of a real estate purchase option contract such that their absence negates formation of a contract?

**THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2008—9:00 A.M.**

**(4) *Schatz v. Allen Matkins Lack Gamble & Mallory LLP, S150371***

#07-160 Schatz v. Allen Matkins Lack Gamble & Mallory LLP, S150371. (D047347; 146 Cal.App.4th 674; Superior Court of San Diego County; GIN045182.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a petition to compel arbitration. This case presents the following issue: Is enforcement of a preexisting arbitration agreement as to a fee dispute between an attorney and client precluded by the Mandatory Fee Arbitration Act (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6200 et seq.)?

**(5) *Musaelian v. Adams et al. (Warner, Objector), S156045***

#07-415 Musaelian v. Adams et al. (Warner, Objector), S156045. (A112906; 153 Cal.App.4th 882; Superior Court of Sonoma County; SCV236208.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. The court limited review to the following issue: Was defendant, an attorney representing himself in a civil action, entitled to an award of attorney fees as a sanction against the plaintiff under Code of Civil Procedure section 128.7 for engaging in frivolous litigation?

**(6) *In re Jose C., S158043***

#08-12 In re Jose C., S158043. (D049525; 155 Cal.App.4th 1115; Superior Court of Imperial County; JIL23536.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed orders in a juvenile wardship proceeding. This case presents the following issue: Can a juvenile wardship proceeding under Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 be predicated entirely on the violation of a federal statute?